

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.		FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR		
10//0/ ///			TIKST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/626,661		07/25/2003	Hideki Hirayama	1794-0157P	1816
2292	7590	12/15/2004			
BIDCH CT	TEXE A T		EXAMINER		
PO BOX 74	. E W A.F  7	RT KOLASCH &	KUNEMUND, ROBERT M		
FALLS CH	FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
				1765	

DATE MAILED: 12/15/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)						
Office Action Summary	10/626,661	HIRAYAMA ET AL.						
Cine Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit						
The MAILING DATE of this committee	Robert M Kunemund	1765						
The MAILING DATE of this communication appeared for Reply	opears on the cover sheet with	h the correspondence address						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailling date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a report of the period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period.  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by stature and the period for reply will, by stature than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONT	oly be timely filed (30) days will be considered timely. HS from the mailing date of this communication.						
Status								
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	•							
	s action is non-final.							
3) Since this application is in condition for allowa	3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is							
closed in accordance with the practice under	Ex parte Quavle 1935 C.D.:	11 453 O.C. 242						
Disposition of Claims	,	11, 433 O.G. 213.						
4) Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application								
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from a second s								
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed.								
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1,2,4-9 and 11-14</u> is/are rejected.								
7)⊠ Claim(s) <u>3 and 10</u> is/are objected to.								
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.							
Application Papers	or election requirement.							
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.							
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).								
Replacement drowing about 1 in 1 i	drawing(s) be held in abeyance	. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.								
The bath of declaration is objected to by the Ex	caminer. Note the attached C	office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		•						
12) △ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) △ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:		19(a)-(d) or (f).						
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.								
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No								
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).								
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.								
and a substitution a list (	or the certified copies not rec	eivea.						
Add to the second secon								
Attachment(s)								
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Interview Summ	nary (PTO-413)						
5) LI Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)	Paper No(s)/Ma 5) Notice of Inform	nil Date nal Patent Application (PTO-152)						
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:	Activ Application (PTO-152)						
S. Patent and Trademark Office TOL-326 (Rev. 1-04) Office Acti	ion Summary	Part of Paner No /Mail Date 20041212						

Application/Control Number: 10/626,661

Art Unit: 1765

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takeuchi et al (5,389,571) in view of Nishizawa et al. (5,338,389).

The Takeuchi et al reference teaches a light-emitting device. The device is a layer structure made by deposition techniques. The emitting layer contains a dopant and is a Group III-V compound semiconductor. The device is also an ultraviolet emitter, note, and cols. 5 and 6. The difference between the instant claims and the prior art is the method used to create the device. However, the Nishizawa et al reference teaches the use of pulse chemical vapor deposition. Each element of the semiconductor is feed to the chamber separately and at a predetermined sequence, note, col3. The gases, which are feed, are sources for III, V and dopant elements. The sources can be metal

Application/Control Number: 10/626,661

Art Unit: 1765

organic compounds such as TMGa, TMAI, Cp Mg, note col. 4. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the Takeuchi et al device by the teachings of the Nishizawa et al reference to grow by pulse deposition in order to increase the control over the layer composition and thickness.

Claims 7, 8, and 11 to 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takeuchi et al (5,389,571) in view of Nishizawa et al. (5,338,389).

The Takeuchi et al and Nishizawa et al references are relied on for the same reasons as stated, supra, and differ from the instant claims in the second dopant. However, the Nishizawa et al reference teaches the use of two dopants, Mg and Si, note col. 4. The dopant sequence in the process can also be varied. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the Takeuchi et al device by the teachings of the Nishizawa et al reference to use two dopants in order to create the desired properties in the final device layer.

Claims 3 and 10 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert M Kunemund whose telephone number is 571-272-1464. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 hours.

Art Unit: 1765

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nadine Norton can be reached on 571-272-1465. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

**RMK** 

ROBERT KUNEMUND PRIMARY EXAMINER